

1 KEVIN V. RYAN (CSBN 118321)
United States Attorney

2 MARK KROTOSKI (CSBN 138549)
3 Chief, Criminal Division

4 BARBARA BRENNAN SILANO (MASSBAR 055540)
STEPHEN H. JIGGER (CSBN 219430)
5 Assistant United States Attorneys

6 450 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, Ca. 94102
7 Tel: (415) 436-7223

8 Attorneys for Plaintiff

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

12 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) No. CR- 06-0316 MHP

13 Plaintiff,)

14 v.)

15 STANLEY JAMES PRYOR, JR., et al.,)

16 Defendants,)

~~PROPOSED~~ SPEEDY TRIAL ORDER

18 GOOD CAUSE APPEARING the Court finds this case complex under 18 U.S.C.
19 §3161(h)(8)(A) and B(i)(ii). The case involves approximately six overlapping months of
20 electronic surveillance on seven separate lines covering four different subject's cellular
21 telephones. Many of the conversations were intercepted using the "Push to Talk" feature on the
22 Nextel phone, increasing the number of conversations counsel will have to review. A portion of
23 the conversations are in Spanish and a portion are in Tongan. The indictment contains
24 allegations against nineteen defendants covering criminal activity over approximately one year in
25 time. Over two thousand pages of discovery have been made available and compact discs
26 containing hundreds of hours of conversations have been provided. The Court finds that the case
27 is so unusual and complex, due to the number of defendants and the nature of the prosecution
28 that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or for the trial itself

SPEEDY TRIAL ORDER

1 within the time limits established under Title 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(ii) and (iv).

2 In addition, time is excluded for the following reasons: because defendants are being
 3 transported from the districts of Hawaii, time is excluded under Title 18 U.S.C. § 3161 (h)(1)(H);
 4 because there are pending motions to detain the defendants, time is also excluded pursuant to 18
 5 U.S.C. § 3161 (h)(1)(F); and because at least one of the defendants has stated that they intend to
 6 hire private counsel and needs time to arrange representation, time is also excluded under 18
 7 U.S.C. § 3161 (h)(8)(B)(iv).

8 The court finds specifically that the ends of justice are best served through the continuance
 9 and the need for effective preparation and other reasons cited herein outweigh the best interest of
 10 the defendants and the public in a speedy trial.

11 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the time period between May 30, 2006 and
 12 July 17, 2006 is excluded from calculations pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A) and B(i),(ii),
 13 and iv; § 3161 (h)(1)(H); 18 U.S.C. § 3161 (h)(1)(F); and 18 U.S.C. § 3161 (h)(8)(B)(iv).

14 DATED: ~~June 29, 2006~~

15 June 30, 2006

